



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tinctly opposed to Bennett's extension of my theory. But this does not, so far as I can see, affect the validity of my conclusions regarding the force of *ne* with the subjunctive.

Bennett inadvertently misrepresents me on p. 65, unless he is still to be understood as limiting his remarks to Plautus. I did not say that verbs of mental action are *never* found in prohibitions expressed by *ne* and *caue* with the perfect subjunctive. My words ('The Latin Prohibitive,' pp. 152-153 [20-21]) were: "in the whole history of the Latin language, from the earliest times down to and including Livy, there are to be found in prohibitions expressed by *ne* with the perfect subjunctive only two, or at most three, verbs denoting *mere* mental activity." I did say that no such instances occur in Plautus, and I still believe that to be true. None of the instances cited by Bennett (p. 65) belong to the class of phenomena of which I was speaking. *Induxeris* and *feceris* are not 'verbs' of mental activity, and his other examples are not instances of *ne* or *caue*. *Animum* with *induxeris* forms, to be sure, an *expression* (though not a 'verb') of mental activity, and should have been referred to by me as a kindred phenomenon. The expression *caue flocci feceris* does not refer to the *mere* mental act of *forming a low or high estimate* (see remarks above on these passages), and *flocci facere* is therefore quite different in character from *putare*, *existimare*, *metuere*, *sperare*, etc., etc.

As the use of the perfect subjunctive with *nec* (*neque*), *nihil*, *ne* . . . *quidem*, *numquam*, etc., is not included in my theory regarding its use with *ne*, consideration of Bennett's *critique* of my interpretation of these passages is reserved for another paper.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

H. C. ELMER.

The Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic,
by KATHARINE ALLEN. (Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Philology and Literature Series, vol. I, pp. 89-219.)

With this dissertation of Miss Allen's and Mr. H. R. Fairclough's suggestive monograph on the attitude of the Greek tragedians towards nature, it would seem as if the claims of the ancients in this particular sphere were in a fair way to being vindicated, and the Philistines who are prone to regard nature as a wholly modern discovery discomfited. While Miss Allen has not so rich a field as her predecessor on the Greek side, and perhaps not so skilful a hand, she has succeeded in getting together a very considerable amount of interesting and valuable material. She gives a detailed treatment of all the poets from Livius Andronicus to Varro Atacinus, with the exception of the writers of comedy. Her method is in the highest degree systematic. In the case of each poet, sky, sea, streams, mountains, etc., are treated in succession,

and under each one of these heads the artist's use of simile and metaphor, the special aspects that he represented, the epithets he used, the type of feeling and appreciation of nature that he manifested, are set forth with copious and for the most part happy illustrations. Especially striking are some of the passages quoted from the early dramatists, and students of Latin literature, to say nothing of the ever-increasing army of students of literature in English, will feel indebted to Miss Allen for drawing forth so many gems, albeit broken, from the dark unfathomed caves of the editions of *fragmenta*. Indeed, the number of good lines found among the *reliquiae* of these pioneers in Latin literature is surprisingly large, e. g. the verse cited from Ennius, p. 98:

lumine sic tremulo terra et cava caerulea candent,

or the shepherd's description of the first ship in Accius, p. 116. Lucretius, naturally enough, forms the *pièce de résistance*, and some forty pages out of a total of one hundred and twenty are devoted to him, most of the passages being quoted in illustration of his appreciation—if so mild a word can be used of the Lucretian *μᾶλα*—of the grander aspects of nature. Among the quotations from Catullus, most noticeable perhaps are the lines in the Peleus and Thetis describing the waves of the sea increasing as the morning breeze freshens, p. 192:

post vento crescente magis magis increbescunt,
purpureaque procul nantes ab luce refulgent.

From Cinna is quoted the couplet

te matutinus flentem conspexit Eous
et flentem paulo vidit post Hesperus idem.

At the end of the treatment of each poet a summary and general view of his attitude towards nature is given, and the whole concludes with a survey of the period.

Miss Allen's work shows signs of an unusually sober judgment, and her estimates of the different poets considered are for the most part sound. Perhaps the only criticism that need be made is that she is disposed to exaggerate the difference between the ancient and the modern attitude towards nature. That there is a difference, a very great difference even, no one will deny; but it is going too far to say that while the Latin poets of this period appreciated the various aspects of nature objectively, they had not, except in rare instances, sympathy with nature. The subjective view of nature so frequently found in modern poetry is, to be sure, less prominent in ancient, but it is there. It is exemplified, for example, in the couplet cited above from Cinna, and can be easily established for Catullus by reference to the thirty-first, the address to Sirmio, and the forty-sixth: iam ver egelidos refert tepores etc. Miss Allen's soberness of judgment, indeed, has the faults of its virtues, and, what is certainly unusual in a doctor's

dissertation, she is inclined to be somewhat pessimistic about her subject and to insist upon her authors' limitations. The irreverent sometimes say that searching Latin authors for examples of syntactical phenomena tends not to enthusiasm, and so perhaps a pilgrimage through the Latin poets in search of purple patches may result in some weariness of spirit.

GORDON LAING.